UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/192,014	11/13/1998	LEIGH L. KLOTZ JR.	D/98703	9266

7590 12/19/2001

JOHN E. BECK
XEROX CORPORATION
XEROX SQUARE 20A
ROCHESTER, NY 14644

EXAMINER
BASHORE, WILLIAM L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 12/19/2001

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/192,014	Klotz, Jr. et al.
Examiner	**Art Unit**
William L. Bashore	2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *Nov 13, 1998*

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL.** 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-13* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideratio

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-13* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement

Application Papers

9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

16) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

17) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). *4, 5*

18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____

19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

20) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: original application filed on **11/13/1998**. IDS filed on 11/13/1998 (paper #4), and 7/9/2001 (paper #5).

2. The Compagnie reference from paper #5 could not be considered because said reference does not contain either an English translation of at least the Abstract, or a statement of relevance (see 37 CFR 1.98, MPEP 609).

3. Claims 1-13 are pending in this case. Claims 1, 7-8, 12-13 are independent claims.

Specification

4. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The following title is suggested: User Interface Identification Tags For A Document Processing System.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. **The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:**

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

6. **Claims 7-10, 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Irons, U.S. Patent No. 6,192,165, filed December 30, 1997, and issued February 20, 2001.**

In regard to independent claim 7, Irons discloses:

- creating user interface tags associated with documents (Irons Abstract; compare with claim 7 "*A method for....comprising the steps of:*").

- receiving information (user ID) reflective of a user, said user ID used for creating a unique document number (Irons column 11 lines 27-42, Figure 5; compare with claim 7 "*receiving user information representative of a user's identity*", and "*creating an identity code based on the user information*").

- storing said number as an index to a database (Irons column 7 lines 50-60; compare with claim 7 "*storing the user information and the identity code in a database*").

- printing a user interface sticker comprising an identity code (Irons column 12 lines 41-50; compare with claim 7 "*generating a printed data code including the identity code*", and "*printing a user interface sticker bearing the printed data code.*").

In regard to independent claim 8, Irons discloses:

- printing a document label comprising a machine-readable data code, said label is associated with, and affixed to a hardcopy document prior to scanning of said document, said code incorporating a user identity code (Irons column 11 lines 4-15, 27-41, column 12 lines 41-60; compare with claim 8 "*A user interface tag....code representative of a user's identity.*").

In regard to dependent claim 9, Irons discloses a label tag to be applied to a hardcopy document (Irons column 12 lines 45-50; compare with claim 9).

In regard to dependent claim 10, Irons discloses an adhesive label (Irons column 19 lines 5-7; compare with claim 10).

In regard to independent claim 12, Irons discloses:

- creating user interface tags associated with documents (Irons Abstract; compare with claim 12 "*An apparatus for....comprising:*").

- receiving information (user ID) reflective of a user, said user ID used for creating a unique document number (identity code) (Irons column 11 lines 27-42, Figure 5; compare with claim 12 "*an identity processor adapted to receive user information and create an identity code*").

- storing said number as an index to a database (Irons column 7 lines 50-60; compare with claim 12 "*a user information database....with the identity code*").

- printing a user interface sticker comprising a machine readable identity code (Irons column 12 lines 41-50, Figure 4; compare with claim 12 "*an output device capable of printing a tag bearing....representative of the identity code*").

In regard to independent claim 13, Irons discloses:

- a scanner for scanning a document along with an affixed label (Irons column 8 lines 1-10; compare with claim 13 "*a scanner adapted....of the document*").

- subsequent to scanning, identifying an decoding the digitized label from said document (Irons column 8 lines 4-10; compare with claim 13 "*an action processor adapted to identify....in the user interface tag*").

- storing said number as an index (linked) to a database for facilitating later retrieval of a document onto an output device (Irons column 7 lines 55-61; compare with claim 13 "*an output device....represented in the user interface sticker.*").

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. **The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:**

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. **Claims 1, 4-6, 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irons, U.S. Patent No. 6,192,165, filed December 30, 1997, and issued February 20, 2001.**

In regard to independent claim 1, Irons teaches:

- a scanner for scanning a document along with an affixed label (Irons column 8 lines 1-10; compare with claim 1 "*A method for processing....comprising the steps of*", and "*scanning the document to produce an image representative of the document*").

- subsequent to scanning, locating and decoding the digitized label from said document, said label associated with a user ID (Irons column 8 lines 4-10, column 11 lines 30-36, Figure 5; compare with claim 1 "*locating the user interface tag in the image*", "*decoding data represented in the user interface tag*", and "*...a user identity...*").

- storing said number as an index (linked) to a database for facilitating later retrieval of a document onto an output device, as well as a document invoice indicative of a service (Irons column 7 lines 55-61, Figure 8, 9). Irons does not specifically teach performing a service associated with document data. However, this limitation would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Irons, because Irons teaches that the machine readable portion of a label may contain additional information, such as information on document disposition (Irons column 11 lines 22-26; compare with claim 1 "*associating the data with a service....performing the specified service*"), suggesting a performed service, and providing the advantage of disposition associated with the invoices of Irons Figure 8, 9.

In regard to dependent claim 4, Irons teaches extracting a user identity code from an analyzed label, said code associated with a database for additional information (Irons column 8 lines 5-14, column 11 lines 29-40, Figure 5; compare with claim 4).

In regard to dependent claims 5-6, Irons teaches storing a code as an index (linked) to a database for facilitating later retrieval of a document onto an output device, as well as a document invoice indicative of a service (Irons column 7 lines 55-61, Figure 8, 9). Irons does not specifically teach extracting a service code. However, this limitation would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Irons, because Irons teaches that the machine readable portion of a label may contain additional information, such as information on document disposition (Irons column 11 lines 22-26; compare with claims 5-6, suggesting a service (or invoice) code associated with said invoice, and providing the advantage of an index code associated with the invoices of Irons Figure 8, 9.

In regard to dependent claim 11, Irons teaches storing a code as an index (linked) to a database for facilitating later retrieval of a document onto an output device, as well as a document invoice indicative of a service (Irons column 7 lines 55-61, Figure 8, 9). Irons does not specifically teach a service code. However, this limitation would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Irons, because Irons teaches that the machine readable portion of a label may contain additional information, such as information on document disposition (Irons column 11 lines 22-26; compare with claim 11, suggesting a service (or invoice) code associated with said invoice, and providing the advantage of an index code associated with the invoices of Irons Figure 8, 9.

9. **Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irons as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of *Xerox touts DataGlyphs for paper data* (hereinafter Xerox), Seybold Report on Desktop Publishing, Vol. 9, No. 5, copyright 1996, pp.1-3, downloaded on 12/6/2001 from <url: http://www.seyboldseminars.com/seybold_report/reports/D0905001.HTM>.**

In regard to dependent claims 2-3, Irons teaches identification of a machine readable ID image bar code label (Irons Figure 4; compare with claim 2 "*identifying a connected component in the image*") Irons teaches the use of high density symbologies for encoding an image file (Irons column 11 lines 18-23). Irons does not specifically teach finding extreme points, determination of a diagonal length, and a rectangle including said points, as well determination of a lattice of glyphs, a seed glyph, identifying a rotation, and converting said glyphs to binary data. However, Xerox teaches DataGlyph coding, which comprises blocks (rectangles) of data represented as diagonal lines, the analyzed slope of which (either left or right) are indicative of binary data within an analyzed block. The data is grouped into blocks to which framing is added.

In addition, said coding is embedded in an error-correcting code utilizing redundant bits, and encoded bytes reordered in a psuedorandom way (requiring a seed) (Xerox pages 1-3, especially bottom of page 1 to top of page 2; compare with claims 2-3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Xerox to Irons, because of Xerox's taught advantage of DataGlyphs, providing the labels of Irons a symbology especially designed for the rigors of a hardcopy environment (Xerox page 2, near top).

Conclusion

10. **Prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to disclosure.**

Klotz, Jr.	U.S. Patent No. 5,459,307	issued	10/1995
Feiler	U.S. Patent No. 5,159,180	issued	10/1992

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William Bashore whose telephone number is **(703) 308-5807**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on **(703) 308-5186**.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is **(703) 305-3900**.

12. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 746-7239 (for formal communications intended for entry)

or:

(703) 746-7240 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

or:

(703) 746-7238 (for after-final communications)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

William L. Bashore
12/7/2001

Joseph H. Feild
JOSEPH H. FEILD
PRIMARY EXAMINER